22 23

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

26

27

Rancheria, its members and Dorothy Andrews (collectively hereinafter "Wilton Miwok Rancheria") submit this Administrative Motion to request that the action filed in the District of Columbia and transferred to this Court be related to the separate action filed by the Plaintiffs-in-Intervention herein in this Court.

28 111

#### I. BACKGROUND

On February 28, 2007, this action, Me-Wuk Indian Community of Wilton Rancheria v. Kempthorne (hereinafter the "D.C. case") was filed in the United States District Court in the District of Columbia. On May 29, 2007, Wilton Miwok Rancheria, its members and Dorothy Andrews filed a motion to intervene in the D.C. case and lodged a motion to transfer the D.C. case to this Court, where a related action was already pending. On October 24, 2007, the D.C. Court granted the motions to intervene and transfer and ordered this case transferred to the Northern District of California. On November 15, 2007, the Honorable William Alsup referred this case to the Honorable Jeremy Fogel for the purpose of determining whether it is related to Wilton Miwok Rancheria v. Kempthorne, et al., No. CV-072681 JF (Complaint filed May 21, 2007) ("Wilton Miwok Rancheria"), filed by the Plaintiffs-in-Intervention herein.

#### II. ARGUMENT

The D.C. Case is related to the action pending in this District before the Honorable District Judge Jeremy Fogel, entitled *Wilton Miwok Rancheria v. Kempthorne*, as defined in Civil L.R. 3-12(a), in that:

- (1) Both actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and
- (2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.

## A. Both Actions Involve Substantially the Same Parties.

### 1. Plaintiffs.

Both the D.C. case and the *Wilton Miwok Rancheria* case, filed in this Court on May 21, 2007, involve the same plaintiffs. Specifically, the Plaintiffs in *Wilton Miwok Rancheria* and the Plaintiffs-in-Intervention in the D.C. case are the same parties: the Wilton Miwok Rancheria, its members, and Dorothy Andrews. Moreover, both cases involve Plaintiffs who assert that they represent the formally federally-recognized Tribe. In any event, all Plaintiffs in both actions are members of the same Tribe, the Wilton Miwok Rancheria.

# 2. Defendants.

The Secretary of Interior is the primary Defendant in both the D.C. case and Wilton Miwok Rancheria.

# B. <u>Both Actions Involve Substantially the Same Property.</u>

Both the D.C. case and *Wilton Miwok Rancheria* seek restoration of the federal recognition of Wilton Miwok Rancheria. Moreover, in both actions, the Plaintiffs seek restoration of a tribal land base. Because this land base will be specific to Wilton Miwok Rancheria, it is clear that both actions involve substantially the same property.

# C. Both Actions Involve Substantially the Same Transaction or Events.

In the D.C. case, Plaintiffs seek substantially the same relief sought through the Complaint in Wilton Miwok Rancheria, declaratory and injunctive relief against the United States' Secretary of Interior to restore Plaintiffs as a federally recognized Indian Tribe. In fact, the Complaints filed by the Wilton Miwok Rancheria in both cases are substantially identical.

# D. The Two Cases Should be Related to Avoid Unduly Burdensome Duplication Of Labor And Expense.

It is clear that because both cases at issue involve the same parties, property and events that if the cases are not related, there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense for all parties and the Court. The Wilton Miwok Rancheria and Dorothy Andrews have filed substantially identical Complaints in each of the two actions. Thus, if the cases are not related, the Wilton Miwok Rancheria and Dorothy Andrews will be forced to prosecute the same claims within two cases, while the United States will be forced to defend the same claims within two cases.

#### III. CONCLUSION

This Court should determine the instant case to be related to *Wilton Miwok Rancheria* because

(i) both actions concern substantially the same parties, property and events and (ii) there will be an

//	,
//	,
11	

///

S GGAN,

	Case 5:07-cv-05706-JF Document 5 Filed 11/20/2007 Page 4 of 4
1	unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted
2	before different Judges.
3	Dated: November 20, 2007 Respectfully submitted,
4	Fredericks Peebles & Morgan llp
5	Christina V. Kazhe John Nyhan
6	Rose Weckenmann
. 7	
8	By: John / Man
9	JOHN NYHAN $\mathcal{U}$ Attorneys for Plaintiffs-in-Intervention,
10	WILTON MIWOK RANCHERIA, a formerly federally-recognized Indian Tribe,
11	and ITS MEMBERS; and DOROTHY ANDREWS
12	MADREWS
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
. 22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	